

NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

**North Seattle Community College
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building
Tuesday, January 24, 2006, 5:15 pm – 7:15 pm**

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its eighteenth meeting at North Seattle Community College on Tuesday, January 24 from 5:15 pm to 7:15 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Approve meeting summary #17;
- Hear and discuss the Thornton Creek Water Quality Channel Design Team's 30% Design Report;
- Review and discuss draft Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) project and program list and next steps, including environmental review;
- Discuss the January 31 Community Forum – purpose and format
- Discuss the future of the Northgate Stakeholders Group

Welcome

Ron LaFayette, Chair, convened the meeting at 5:15 pm, welcomed Stakeholders and observers to the meeting, and provided a brief orientation to the Stakeholder packets. He introduced new stakeholder representatives and alternates: Tamara Storie, alternate for Businesses Inside the Mall, and Devin Nilsen, Student Representative; and announced that Jeff Coate would represent Businesses Inside the Mall and Jody Westfall would be alternate for Businesses Outside the Mall.

Northgate Status Report

Jackie Kirn of the Office of Policy and Management briefly reviewed a written status report (handout) on projects and activities in the Northgate area in the following categories:

New park site acquisition

- Mayor and King County Executive signed a memorandum of intent for the City to buy the site at 5th Ave. NE and NE 112th St. in September.
- Mayor has sent legislation to City Council to approve the sale and interim lease to King County.
- Stakeholders may make public comments at two Seattle City Council meetings of the Parks, Neighborhoods and Education and Environment Committee: February 1, 2006 and February 15, 2006 at 2:00 pm.

- Action is expected at the February 15 Committee meeting, the full Council will then consider it, and the transaction is expected to close by the end of March.

Northgate Library, Community Center and Park

- Construction is underway and on schedule, although it was slowed by rain.
- Facilities will open in June or early July of 2006.

5th Ave. NE Streetscape

- Construction is scheduled to begin mid-February and to be completed by end of May.

Northgate Commons

- DPD recommendations on contract rezone and Master Use Permit were issued November 24, 2005.
- Hearing Examiner's recommendation was issued January 20, 2006.
- Seattle City Council is to begin consideration on February 22 and take final action in March.

South Lot Planning

- Construction is to begin by mid-June.
- Design details and permits are on-going.
- Lorig and Seattle Public Utilities completed Memorandum of Understanding #2 on coordinated site design and construction.
- Some contracts with details of construction will get started very soon.

South Lot sidewalks and traffic signal

- Council approved Mayor's proposed funding for sidewalks for the Thornton Creek Channel project and partial funding for new traffic signal. (There will be private funding as well.)

Northgate Mall Expansion

- Simon applied for several building permits.
- Demolition of theater and medical building is completed.

Proposed new development

- Wallace Properties completed the Early Design Guidance process and applied for Master Use Permit in December.
- Mullally Development Company and Potter (Kauri Development) are proceeding with their respective preliminary plans.

Northgate Art

- Public Arts Committee has reviewed Thornton Creek Water Quality Channel art proposals

Maple Leaf Community Garden

- Bidding and beginning of construction is scheduled in spring.

Pinehurst Pocket Park

- Construction is to begin, hopefully, in spring and be completed by fall.

Approval of the January 24, 2006 Meeting Summary

There were no corrections or additions to the draft summary of the October 18, 2005 meeting, so it was approved as drafted.

Thornton Creek Water Quality Channel Design

The Chair introduced Miranda Maupin of Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) to report on the design team's work on 30% design. (Copies of her PowerPoint presentation were in Stakeholder packets.) Other presenters included project manager Tom Fawthrop and drainage engineer Masako Lo of SPU, Greg Giraldo and Melanie Davies of SvR Engineering, Peggy Gaynor of Gaynor, Inc., and Randy Barber of Olympic Associates.

Ms. Maupin presented a diagram that showed the main features of the Thornton Creek Water Quality Channel. She said that the primary function of the channel was to provide water quality for drainage from 680 acres. She indicated an upper cascade, water features with falling water, a second diversion, and a low flow channel that would carry flow year-round.

Ms. Maupin reviewed the four key issues that were the focus of the design team's work:

1. Landscape design and pedestrian access
2. Grading and retaining walls
3. Water quality and channel design
4. Cost and constructability

Ms. Maupin noted that the design team had been asked to keep in mind the two project goals of improving water quality for Thornton Creek and providing pleasing public open space as well as the values the Stakeholders had expressed in their advice to the City.

Ms. Maupin then introduced Tom Fawthrop to review some of the recommendations that the design team produced. Mr. Fawthrop explained that the Design Team had divided the four key design issues into three components: issue identification, development of recommendations, and visual support.

After explaining the issues related to landscape design and pedestrian access, Mr. Fawthrop referenced a diagram of the channel and described the design team's recommendations to provide a stairwell from 4th Ave. NE and NE 100th St. (not shown on diagram), to enhance the pedestrian experience and to enhance planting design. He noted that the recommendations were intended in part to create a more varied experience for the pedestrian and to increase security. David Harrison, facilitator, noted that reconsideration and reinsertion of the stairway at 4th Ave. NE and NE 100th St. was a direct response to a request from the Stakeholders.

Next, Mr. Fawthrop reviewed the issues related to the grading and retaining walls, and used a diagram to help illustrate the design team's recommendations to vary the wall type and wall slopes. He explained that concrete walls would be used to reflect an urban character, while "soft," green walls would provide more contours and a more natural setting. He noted that the water in the channel could flow against the green walls.

For water quality and channel design, Mr. Fawthrop said that altering the design had been a challenge, but that the design team had moved away from using a series of smaller weirs to using fewer large weirs that would back up water 40 to 50 feet, creating ponded areas that would break up the flow. He noted the design team's recommendation to use natural gravel and fines, which will solidify as water flows over it, instead of concrete for the channel bed.

Next, Mr. Barber of Olympic Associates presented the results of his cost-constructability review of the channel, which supported the planning and decisions made to date. Mr. Barber explained that he had reviewed cost estimates for hybrid and hybrid terrace design and had found little opportunity to reduce costs while maintaining project goals and Stakeholder values. He reviewed his recommendations, including his advice not to wait until 60% design to finalize wall details and locations.

Ms. Maupin then described the next steps in the project, noting that the schedule for permitting and construction was very fast. Nancy Ahern, Deputy Director of the Science, Sustainability & Watersheds Branch of Seattle Public Utilities, commented that the project design had been significantly improved by Stakeholder advice and the work of the design team, and she thanked everybody for their contributions.

Steve Bolliger of Lorig stressed that Lorig was working all day every day with SPU and King County Metro on the 3rd Ave. NE design, because it was critical for them to meet the scheduled dates. He explained that they were now addressing the details of grades and connections and that the project would be submitted to SPU for grading very soon. He emphasized the importance of meeting the dates in the schedule to allow excavation to begin during the summer's favorable weather.

Before facilitating a question and answer session, Alice Shorett, facilitator, reminded the Stakeholders that they were not tasked with preparing advice on the design team recommendations.

Comments/Questions/Responses

Question: How will the bridges be constructed in the absence of weirs? How wide will they be? Will the bridges cross the full expanse of the creek bed? What will the height above the creek be?

Response (Greg Giraldo): The bridges will be built on concrete retaining walls. The span of the main bridge will be 26 feet, although the actual bridge will be longer and extend into the plaza area. That is the only real bridge; it will be six or seven feet above the channel. The other crossings will be more like earth bridges with culverts underneath. They will be closer to the upper channel where less water and less storm flow will come through. They will be lower than the main bridge.

Question: Will the creek meet the green wall during peak flows?

Response (Greg Giraldo): Yes, during a 25 year storm event, the water will rise about three feet and will meet the green wall.

Question: Is the vegetation intended to hold the green wall together when the water meets the wall?

Response (Greg Giraldo): The flow will not be fast.

Response (Randy Barber): To build a green wall, material similar to woven plastic is laid down and structural material is backfilled and overlapped. The geotextile fabric helps give the wall strength.

Response (Peggy Gaynor): The cascade at 110th St. NW has the same type of green wall: soil wrapped walls with water touching. They hold up perfectly. It's a smaller scale there but the Thornton Creek project will have less velocity.

Question: After complimenting the design team on the 30% design, a Stakeholder asked how people, especially children, would be prevented from getting into the channel.

Response (Tom Fawthrop): This is a concern that was raised internally. A safety railing will run around the site, especially at higher walls. We are planning for a ramp into the channel for maintenance purposes that people could walk down, but they would be stopped before entering the channel.

Response (Nancy Ahern): We will also post a code of conduct, like at a public park, that says, "Please stay out of the channel."

Response (Peggy Gaynor): The plantings will also discourage entry, but ambitious kids will find a way to get in. For safety's sake, it will be easy to get out.

Question: After thanking the design team for restoring access from NE 100th St., a Stakeholder asked why, on one of the landscape design and pedestrian access diagrams, some sections of the walkway were labeled "enclosed" and others "open." She asked what the pedestrian experience would be in the enclosed areas. She also asked if there would be pedestrian access on the south and east sides of the channel, outside of formal walkways.

Response (Melanie Davies): "Enclosed" means an area with trees and tree canopy. We have tried to differentiate the experience along the entire channel, so from the corner of NE 103rd St. and 4th Ave. NE and near the corner of NE 100th St. and 3rd Ave. NE by Northgate Commons, the pedestrian would descend through an enclosed area and continue into an open area. We tried to create rhythm and differentiation so the pedestrian would experience the channel in several different ways.

Question: A Stakeholder asked if there would be access at the corner of NE 100th St. and 3rd Ave. NE or along 5th Ave. NE where there was no formal walkway.

Response (Melanie Davies): No. Because the slope is so steep, stairs are necessary to descend to the channel. We are studying ways to have public access at that corner without going through Northgate Commons.

Response (Peggy Gaynor): Access at that corner is called the shortcut, but it has not been fully studied. We are also trying to create a visual screen to the noisy, busy street.

Comment: A Stakeholder commented that the plans were lovely. She noted that it was important to connect the site to outside, public rights-of-way.

Question: One Stakeholder noted that a path had been there previously and asked if it had been cut. He said that if the idea were to move people from one corner to the other, it would not be a good idea to make them loop around to the Northgate Commons access point.

Comment: Another Stakeholder opined that people would cut through that corner anyway.

Response (Miranda Maupin): There is a significant grade drop at that corner.

Comment: A Stakeholder said that she was very pleased and that the design team and everyone else had done a terrific job. She said the project would be a real asset to the whole area and thanked the design team.

Comment: After commending the design team on the two-phased approach, a Stakeholder stressed that it was important to get the work started. He didn't believe that the project cost would be affected so much by fuel prices as by wet soil. He encouraged doing excavation this summer and urged the City to get the project out to bid.

Comment: A Stakeholder noted that the Thornton Creek Alliance Executive Board thought the design had turned out well.

Question: A Stakeholder asked if the next step was to proceed through the bid.

Response (Mark Troxel): We're scheduling a 60% design update at the next Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting.

Response (Jackie Kirn): The design of the Thornton Creek Water Quality Channel will be discussed at the Seattle Design Commission meeting at 1 PM, on February 2nd at City Hall.

The Chair observed the huge amount of progress that was evident and the spirit and intensity of work that had been done. While the Stakeholders applauded, he thanked the design team for its effort. Mr. Harrison suggested that the Stakeholders prepare a memorandum to thank SPU for developing a design that reflected the Stakeholder advice. The Stakeholders agreed to let the Chair prepare the memorandum and forward it to SPU on their behalf.

Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) Discussion of local traffic impacts, parking and implementation of improvements

The Chair introduced Mr. Harrison to facilitate the CTIP discussion. Mr. Harrison noted the high attendance (two-thirds) and active participation at CTIP Subcommittee meetings by Stakeholders and City staff. He explained that because so many Stakeholders had attended CTIP Subcommittee meetings, he would review only the high points of the subcommittee's discussions. The intent at the current meeting, he said, was to afford the Stakeholders review of CTIP before preparing advice on CTIP.

Mr. Harrison then reviewed the anticipated schedule for completing advice (handout). He noted that the next steps would be:

- The release of the final draft at the end of February
- Two CTIP Subcommittee meetings in March
- Community Forum, March 28
- One CTIP Subcommittee meeting after the Community Forum to draft advice
- Stakeholders meeting (May 9)

Mr. Harrison noted that the Stakeholder packets contained the priority projects. He reminded the Stakeholders that they had shaped the criteria used to flag the projects, the CTIP Subcommittee had flagged the projects, and that, separately from CTIP, the Stakeholders had supported a potential cap on the freeway near the North Seattle Community College. He commented that many detailed questions had been posed to SDOT.

Mr. Harrison suggested the current discussion focus on three key policy questions that had emerged:

1. The impact on neighborhood streets of major transportation issues: how do you monitor the impact on residential streets and take action as traffic flows change and increase?
2. How proposed changes to parking regulations in Northgate area would, for the most part, bring Northgate in line with the rest of the City.
3. What to expect in terms of how CTIP will be implemented, including permitting and the design review process.

Neighborhood Streets

Mr. Mazzella provided more detail about the residential streets questions. He noted that the City wants CTIP to be a holistic plan for Northgate that considers all street classifications and that can be flexible as situations change.

Mr. Mazzella described the typical problems:

- Classic cut-through traffic that occurs when intolerable congestion exists on arterial streets and non-neighborhood people pass through the community via the local street system. This problem exists city-wide and in cities all over the country.
- Connectivity of the street system: Northgate has many streets that don't go through, which limits alternative arterial routes.

Mr. Mazzella said that CTIP does not propose to create new streets or punch roads through, so any action must occur within the existing street system, with some minor adjustments.

He noted the relationship between arterial streets and local streets and said that improvements to arterials would reduce incidents on local streets.

Mr. Mazzella said that the City had measured traffic speeds and volumes on 22 local, non-arterial streets and had used the data, along with information about pedestrian facilities, bicycle routes, and school walking routes to score the streets. He said that CTIP recommends specific improvements on three streets that scored above 60.

In addition, Mr. Mazzella said that there were many improvements in CTIP for residential arterial streets that would benefit residents who walk or bike through the area. SDOT is working on CTIP cost estimates, which total roughly \$50 million; pedestrian and bike improvements make up over 40 percent of the total.

Finally, Mr. Mazzella said that it would be critical for his department to monitor changes in traffic speeds and volumes. Doing so would help SDOT see whether development raised any streets from lower to higher scores, at which point SDOT would need to work with the community to decide if action were warranted.

Comments/Questions/Responses

Question: Is the cost breakout of pedestrian and bike improvements included in the cost of the overcrossing of the freeway.

Response (Tony Mazzella): Yes.

Comment: The freeway overcrossing is half the cost of all of the pedestrian and bike improvements.

Question: How much would the freeway overpass cost?

Response (Tony Mazzella): It is estimated as a \$7-10 million cost so we have some flexibility.

Question: A Stakeholder, noting that there were near-term, mid-term, and longer-term recommendations, asked how the near-term recommendations related to the pedestrian recommendations.

Response (Tony Mazzella): The priority projects for local streets are all apportioned to the near-term recommendations. The traffic calming pedestrian facilities on all streets are recommended as high priority in the near-term.

Comment: A Stakeholder noted that, during her 20 years of working on traffic issues, she was acquainted with two of the three streets that scored over 60. She said that residents on those streets complained that the streets were unlivable because of the speed and volume of traffic. She expressed concern that issues of livability that the Stakeholders had tried to identify in the performance criteria would not be addressed. She worried that SDOT action would be problem-based, that more and more residential streets would become unlivable under the CTIP criteria, and that there was a danger of responding only after an area had become unlivable.

Response (Tony Mazzella): It would be very helpful to flag that issue in the advice.

Question: A Stakeholder inquired if SDOT planned to include the three top priorities for CTIP in this biennial budget process and, if SDOT was ready to make a request, how much money would be requested.

Response (Tony Mazzella): Since CTIP is not yet completed, it has not been formally proposed yet. We will not be ready to line up funding for 2007. However, a project now on NE 98th St., which is one of our priorities, is an exception. I think funding will be available for that.

Question: Is the list of the 22 streets that were evaluated available, including the scoring and criteria.

Response (Tony Mazzella): Yes. We can distribute it to you.

Question: A Stakeholder said she didn't see the priority project in Pinehurst on 115th in the CTIP packet.

Response (Tony Mazzella): It's under near-term improvements under CTIP Goal: Protect Neighborhoods, shown as B-2.

Mr. Harrison pointed out that many of these details were in the draft plan.

Parking Regulations

Kristian Kofoed and Megan Shepherd of SDOT addressed proposed changes to parking regulations in the Northgate area. They explained that the draft parking recommendations were divided into on-street, off-street and cooperative arrangements.

Mr. Kofoed noted that as Northgate developed, grew, changed, and land values increased, parking would become an increasingly important issue. He said that the draft on-street and off-street parking recommendations in CTIP (available in a handout) could help meet two of the Northgate vision goals:

- to regulate parking so residents are not impacted, and
- not to require excessive parking of commercial developments such that development is inhibited.

He noted that the draft parking recommendations focused mainly on activities in the core and on the surrounding area that would most likely be impacted by developments in the core. Ms. Shepherd pointed out that the draft parking recommendations addressed parking management, as opposed to assigning different types of parking spots, for example.

Ms. Shepherd reviewed the draft off-street recommendations and explained that they would bring regulations for the Northgate Overlay District into line with regulations for the rest of the City as follows:

- allow shared parking between retail stores and other uses, such as a transit center,
- allow a reduction in parking requirements if alternative forms of transit are available and/or promoted, which is the case at Northgate,
- have more ambitious, specific mode-split goals,
- allow residential uses to meet their parking requirements off-site, and
- address cooperative agreements for a Transportation Management Association to facilitate parking management and act as a central clearinghouse for excess parking supply or demand.

Mr. Harrison pointed out that all of the draft recommendations are included in the draft CTIP and that the purpose of the presentation was to alert the Stakeholders to changes that had been proposed and to find out if there were any problem areas that had not been raised in subcommittee.

Comments/Questions/Responses

Question: A Stakeholder expressed concern about draft off-street parking recommendation #4. She noted that Pinehurst is targeted for multi-family housing around 15th Ave. NE, NE 125th St., and Roosevelt Way and said that, because each unit had only one parking space, a great many extra cars were parked on the street in front of single family homes. She asked if allowing one car per unit was appropriate when most modern families have two cars.

Response (Tony Mazzella): Usually the City's requirement is for 1.3 parking spaces per unit, except when the number is reduced for low income or senior housing.

Comment: A Stakeholder objected to the current retail maximum for parking stalls and asked that it be considered for elimination. He said that it was not an effective maximum and that it was impossible to run a business with that amount of parking and that it stifled good development in the urban corridor, without providing aesthetic or traffic benefits.

Response (Barbara Mitchell): The subcommittee talked briefly about the trade-offs of providing relief from parking requirements or providing something to balance, like multi-modal transit. Transit must be taken seriously. For example, give out bus passes instead of just posting a schedule. There is a great economic benefit to not having to build parking or to use land for parking. The CTIP recommendations should be paired with a proposal from King County Metro. If you're going to do transit, really do it.

Response (Kristian Kofoed): The Northgate Overlay District requires you to provide bus passes, but the requirement isn't linked to parking.

Question: Regarding the multi-modal center, a stakeholder asked whether SDOT had figured out how to coordinate with King County Metro to provide better bus service for people in the area who do not have places for their cars.

Response (Ron Posthuma): King County Metro is making an effort, but it is a challenge as a transit provider for the county. Sixty percent of our service is already in Seattle, and suburban areas want to know where their share is. We are looking for ideas for urban centers like Northgate such as partnerships with the City, business, etc.

Mr. Harrison announced that there were enough questions and concerns raised about the draft parking recommendations to warrant Mr. Kofoed's and Ms. Shepherd's attendance at the next CTIP subcommittee meeting.

Implementation

Lyle Bicknell of DPD reviewed the four key implementation mechanisms for CTIP, as follows:

1. There is a specific regulation codified in the land use portion of the Seattle Municipal Code for the design of key streets, major pedestrian streets, special arterials, etc. The code is very prescriptive: it dictates sidewalk widths, street trees, how facades meet sidewalks, etc. Those kinds of specifications in CTIP should be incorporated clearly into the land use code.
2. Private development projects are evaluated by the Design Review Board. The Design Review program will be bolstered by Northgate-specific design review guidelines for open space, connectivity, pedestrian corridors, and other elements.
3. The document you have is a blueprint focused on private and public development in the South Lot area. We wanted to make it an urban design blueprint, making sure that it's integrated and seamless and that it takes advantage of Stakeholder input. It is now desirable to extend the blueprint north.
4. The Mayor has directed staff to work in a collaborative and coordinated fashion to take advantage of capital improvements and private development to create a well-designed, seamless public realm.

Mr. Harrison noted that the review of CTIP implementation strategies had been in response to questions from Stakeholders about oversight. He also explained that everything the Stakeholders had said that evening would be carried forward. He said that the Stakeholders and City staff would be asked to consider these issues further at the next Stakeholders meeting.

Discussion of the Future of the Northgate Stakeholders Group after CTIP Completion in mid 2006

The Chair remarked that, although CTIP was keeping the Stakeholders busy and there was more work to be done, the Stakeholder Advisory Group had an endpoint. He introduced Ms. Shorett to lead a discussion about the future of the Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Ms. Shorett reiterated that the Stakeholders Advisory Group was reaching the end of its commitment, as the Stakeholders had provided all of the advice originally envisioned for the Group except for the final advice on CTIP. She said that the future of the Group was up for discussion. She noted that the Stakeholders had expressed their interest in continuing to track activities in the Northgate area, such as large lot development, and in continuing to meet, albeit less frequently, to hear reports from the City and from developers about what was unfolding in the area related to the Group's advice.

Ms. Shorett said that one idea was to hold a meeting for two to three hours twice a year, possibly in a community forum format, or a combined stakeholder group meeting/community forum. She asked the Stakeholders if they were willing to invest time in the future to track these issues and which topics would be of interest. The Chair noted that City staff could help develop ideas offered by the Stakeholders.

Comments/Questions/Responses

Comment: One Stakeholder commented that it was necessary to follow CTIP progress, especially since many of the recommendations did not have funding yet. She said the community should remain a driver for progress. However, she questioned whether the Stakeholders Advisory Group was the appropriate venue, remarking that neighborhood groups did good work and suggesting that perhaps the Stakeholders Group could follow traffic issues. She believed that nothing would get done if the community didn't stay engaged.

Comment: Another Stakeholder mentioned a new project she would like to see addressed through a process similar to the Stakeholders Group: a new park north of Northgate Way. She noted that there were many needs and requests for a park there, especially because of the Mullally development and others in the area.

Comment: A Stakeholder expressed her delight that the Mayor had signed on to buy the park and ride lot. Noting that communication solves a lot of problems, she agreed that the Stakeholders needed to stay involved with projects in the area to make sure they got funded and completed.

Comment: A Stakeholder expressed reservations about further Stakeholder meetings. While she agreed it was a good idea to maintain communication and track proposed projects, she said she had been discouraged with the stakeholder process. She said she thought the idea that the Stakeholders had had substantial ability to influence the process was deceptive. Her sense was that the city had told the Stakeholders what was happening and had told them that they could make an impact, but that it had not been true. She said that there had been insufficient time to talk about the issues. If the purpose of future work were simply a report out, she would rather receive an e-mail.

Comment: Another Stakeholder said she shared some of the feelings of frustration and disappointment. She felt that the best moments of the stakeholder process had been in subcommittees where there had been more opportunity for discussion. She regretted that

there had not been an opportunity to discuss people's dreams and visions for the area. She wished there had been more chances for the Stakeholders to work together to make the area healthier.

Comment: A Stakeholder pointed out that people had come together in a previously non-existent forum through the Stakeholders Group. He noted that while expectations had not been realized for some, he had found the process personally enlightening in terms of understanding the community. He said that he would like to see the Stakeholders Group continue. He noted that the hoped-for outcomes might still materialize.

Response (Alice Shorett): Maybe, as someone suggested, we could provide more opportunities for informal interaction.

Comment: A Stakeholder acknowledged feelings of discouragement but noted achievements like daylighting Thornton Creek and improving landscaping at the mall. She remarked that when change happens, problems arise, but change is inevitable. Her impression was that people did not want an increase in traffic, which she thought was impossible, although she felt it was a good idea to try to get people out of their cars by walking or biking more. She said she hoped the Stakeholders were not totally disappointed. She also noted that when development was closer at her own organization's property, she would be happy to share the plans with the Stakeholders.

The Chair asked the Stakeholders for their thoughts on how the Stakeholder process might be structured in the future.

Comment: One Stakeholder said that she wanted the meetings to continue. She said that the Stakeholders had produced many good ideas. She cautioned that if they didn't follow up, they were bound to be disappointed.

Comment: Another Stakeholder reiterated that she was not opposed to development, but that it was difficult to feel heard when she was told that increased traffic was not due to local business development but to regional development and thus that there was no way to pay for it. She thought there should be a discussion about how to pay for it, since the development community said it was not their responsibility. She said that she did not want to stand in the way of change, but that change had to be balanced, rational, and to include everybody.

Comment: A Stakeholder suggested continuing to meet but in a different format, to hang onto the progress that had been made.

The Chair said it sounded like the Stakeholders wanted to keep meeting and that they wanted to discuss the format and other details. He asked the Stakeholders to indicate their willingness to keep meeting in some form by a show of hands. A large majority raised their hands. The Chair reiterated that the work of the facilitators was coming to a close, noting that the Group would need to work with the City to plan a way to keep meeting. Ms. Shorett suggested providing a handout of options at the next Stakeholders Advisory Group meeting.

Mr. Harrison mused that the nice thing about the Stakeholder comments about making too little progress was that the Stakeholders dreamed big. He said that, based on his 35 years of experience with similar processes, the Stakeholders had had a tremendous impact on plans in the Northgate area, even though some did not feel that way.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Meeting Attendance

Representatives and Alternates of the **Northgate Stakeholders Group** in attendance were:

Metro/King County: Rep. Ron Posthuma

Simon Properties: Rep. Gary Weber, Alt. Sam Stalin

Maple Leaf Community Club: Rep. Janice Camp

Haller Lake Community Club: Rep. Velva Maye

Pinehurst Community Council: Rep. Lorna Mrachek

Victory Heights Community Council: Rep. Brad Cummings, Alt. Molly Burke

Thornton Creek Alliance: Alt. Cheryl Klinker

North Seattle Community College: Ron LaFayette, Alt. Bruce Kieser

Owners of Three or More Acres: Rep. Kevin Wallace

Senior Housing: Rep. Jeanne Hayden

Renters/Condominium Owners: Rep. Brad Mason, Alt. Rick Kosterman

Multi-Family Housing Developers: Rep. Colleen Mills

Businesses Inside the Mall: Alt. Tamara Storie

Businesses Outside the Mall: Rep. Michelle Rupp

Youth: Rep. Devin Nilsen

Labor: Rep. David Hellene

At-large: Rep. Shawn Olesen

At-large: Rep. Marilyn Firlotte

Members of the Triangle Associates facilitation team included David Harrison, Alice Shorett, and Ellen Blair.